DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BLOGGERS ROUNDTABLE WITH MAJOR GENERAL DAVID HALVERSON, DIRECTOR OF ARMY FORCE DEVELOPMENT VIA TELECONFERENCE TIME: 1:01 P.M. EDT DATE: THURSDAY, AUGUST 28, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_\_

Copyright (c) 2008 by Federal News Service, Inc., Ste. 500 1000 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA. Federal News Service is a private firm not affiliated with the federal government. No portion of this transcript may be copied, sold or retransmitted without the written authority of Federal News Service, Inc. Copyright is not claimed as to any part of the original work prepared by a United States government officer or employee as a part of that person's official duties. For information on subscribing to the FNS Internet Service, please visit http://www.fednews.com or call(202)347-1400

(Note: Please refer to www.dod.mil for more information.)

LINDY KYZER (U.S. ARMY PUBLIC AFFAIRS): Hi, this is Lindy with Army Public Affairs again. I think we're going to go ahead and get started.

Thank you so much for joining us today for this Bloggers Roundtable. We are very pleased to have Major General David Halverson. He's the director of Army Force Development. He's here to speak about the release of the 2008 Army Modernization Strategy. All of you should have received a link to that via email. I award bonus points for anyone who read it cover to cover between Tuesday and now.

Again, Major (General) Halverson is here to introduce the strategy and discuss the four elements of Army modernization. Following a few minutes of remarks, we'll take your questions. We do have just 30 minutes for this roundtable, so I want to ask you to go ahead and keep it to one question. If we have to time to go back through the line-up we certainly will. And also, please keep your mute button on when not asking a question so we can eliminate that background noise.

Now, I'd like to introduce Major General David Halverson, for his opening remarks. Thank you so much.

GEN. HALVERSON: Okay, thanks, Lindy. And thanks, everyone.

My name is Dave Halverson. I'm the director of Force Development here in the Army G-8. And it's a great day for us, because I -- this is the -- we've just published our Army Modernization Strategy. And we're excited about it because it's different than business as usual.

Many times, with a modernization strategy, everyone's so focused on here's a weapons system or here's a certain thing and here's what it can do; here's what it can't do. And it's like a catalog of just performance measures. This strategy that we've worked very hard with is much shorter, much better, because it actually explains why we have a modernization, why we modernize within the force, especially in the persistent conflicts.

So we're very proud of it, because it really -- you know, working with the chief of staff on his imperatives, looking at how we have to modernize in this area of persistent conflict and what our elements are, which are really, like, rapidly equip the best equipment to our soldiers in the current force; you

know, upgrade and modernize existing systems to ensure the soldiers have the equipment they need to fight; you know, incorporate all the new technologies that we've derived from the Future Combat Systems and research and development, those things, spinning them out to the force; and then field the Future Combat Systems to brigade combat teams, very important.

Those elements are not only where we want to be in the future, but what we have to do in this era of persistent conflict, that our soldiers have the equipment they need to fight and win, with the enemies they're facing.

And then it's also linked to really how we operate as an Army, which is, you know, the FM 3-0 just got released by, you know, General Caldwell and everything like that, and General Wallace -- great hallmark, the first -- (audio break) -- published in a long time. So those are all nested in the aspect of how do we restore balance and obtain full-spectrum dominance as a land power. And so we're just excited.

And so without further ado -- just to let you know, I don't plan on talking programmatics and stuff, because in the budget cycle, we're still predecisional, so I don't have all the figures. So if I get that, I probably won't talk to that. So that'll help you just scope your questions a little bit. And so I hope that helps you.

So without that, I'll turn it over for questions.

MS. KYZER: Okay, Scott, did you have a question?

Q Yeah, actually, I have one. I don't know if it's in the strategy guide or not. One question that comes from another writer at Flopping Aces is, how do we maintain a technical and industrial base within the U.S. which allows us to design and build these systems and at the same time encourage engineers and computer experts and others associated with R&D production to go through school -- rather than getting a liberal arts degree, to get technical degrees?

GEN. HALVERSON: Hey, Scott, that's a great question.

As a matter of fact, I was just at a National Defense Industry Association conference three weeks ago on robotics. And one of the tenets we talked about is how do you get kids and folks excited about science and technology, getting an industrial base built up for us.

And we have those discussions, because I concur we are getting much weaker, because if you look at the demographics that you have in your universities and what you look at in your masters programs and even Ph.D. programs, it's at risk.

I'm very fortunate to be a co-chair to the Army Science and Technology Board, where I sit with the chief scientist, Dr. Tom Killian (sp). And what we do is that we look at the science and technology investments that we want to do and we make those advice to the chief of staff and things. And working with Major General Doug Robinson, who is the research and development commander, RDCOM, he has all the (scientists?) that really work these issues.

One of the good things about like the Future Combat System and all that is, we are pushing the edge on stuff and how do we get, you know, (as we call it ?), technology technical levels like 1, which is far out, down into quicker --

get it into technical levels 6 and 7 that we need that we can actually apply into our systems.

So we within the Defense Department, and obviously within the Army, are pushing those things because I think it's very important, because our soldiers deserve the best, as they're fighting on foreign soil, to be able to have that so we can quickly give them the best advantage over the enemy.

MS. KYZER: Jason, do you have a question?

Q Yes. Sir, I'm going to look a little bit closer at the chem-bio stuff. I was a little surprised to see the M8 alarm only fading out in 2012, and the decon systems, the M12, M17 decon systems lasting far past the POM. I understand we had some real difficulties with especially the decon systems in OIF. And I understand these are probably programmatic and a little bit too low level for you to respond to.

I wanted to talk more about the Stryker NBC Reconnaissance Vehicle. That's also listed out all the way to 2020. Now, when I looked at the FCS program, I know the Scout vehicle was going to kind of take over the stand-off detection capability. But is this saying we're going to be having Strykers for a good time ahead past the initial FCS fielding? Is there a date where you ever see that you think the Strykers might be pulled out of the service, so to speak?

GEN. HALVERSON: Well, Jason, that's a good question and a very indepth question. One, I appreciate that you are very focused on chemical and biological concerns, because they're a real-world threat. You know, what keeps me up -- awake at night are some of those chem-bio threats that not only we have on foreign soil but also here in the homeland. And we are very, you know, concerned about that and trying to get that capability into our systems.

Obviously you have talked about the Stryker, you know, NBCR (sic), which will be that vehicle that we'll pull forward to give that capability. And that will be a certain force that we do have in our things.

But as we work with FCS and stuff, and there is the -- the ground system will have an embedded type, you know, chemical detections and stuff, and that will be part of its protection phase of that. So that's what we're pushing as we have this integrated system, as we look forward into the Future Combat Systems, to be able to do that, because we know that environment will be very uneasy, very unpredictable, and we need to make sure that we do -- to be able to do it.

But if you do look like -- like about page 42 and 43, you'll see that in the blocks the NBCRV -- is kind of blocked, as you see, through 20 into the 30 time frame. So they're out there for a while. That will be a certain level of force. And obviously, as we get our Future Combat Systems ground vehicle -- (common ?) ground vehicles and stuff, they'll have that self-protection already built in and facilitated in that environment the soldiers may have to fight in.

Does that help out?

Q It does. Thanks very much.

GEN. HALVERSON: Okay.

MS. KYZER: Okay. Greg, did you have a question?

Q I do. There was talk some time ago about the active protection system being one of the spin-outs, at least to the heavy brigade teams. And I don't see anywhere in the modernization where it even -- I don't even see a mention of active protection. Maybe I missed it. But is there something -- is that program or that technology developing slower than you had anticipated? Is that why I don't see that in there? GEN. HALVERSON: Greg, that's a good question. Obviously protection's very important, and we're looking at certain capabilities which we can (spin out ?), and that's what -- really what James Terry's down there with the ATF to inform us what can be spun out or whatever.

Right now, as we see things, we know that the MGV will have the active protective systems, and that's where some of the focus -- but as things mature and then whatever, we'll be looking at different options of what does get spun out. And that's going to be a deliberate, you know, process to see what those capabilities are.

But like you said, protection's very big, because right now, as you know, you know, we got basically a (crew ?) device on the MRAP or something like that, trying to protect us from the IEDs, but that doesn't help too much with an RPG, someone coming from inside the -- on the streets or whatever, shooting an RPG or something like that, plus detect or defeat it very well.

So we are -- it's work to be done. But just like you said, the active protective system is really being nested into the integration of the MGV at this time.

But on these spin-outs, the chief of staff in our modernization -- we've kept options open to see what does develop and if it should be pushed into the current force.

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}$  So is it developing a little slower than anticipated, would you say, the program itself?

GEN. HALVERSON: Oh, not that I know of. I mean -- and I think it's on schedule, from what my folks tell me that track the Future Combat System.

Q Great. Thank you.

GEN. HALVERSON: Yeah.

MS. KYZER: And John, did you have a question?

Q Pardon me. I had to find my mute button. (Laughter.)

Yeah. GEN. HALVERSON: Having the same problems here, John.

Q Well, taking away the programmatic questions -- knocked off two of them; you saved yourself there -- I'm going to come at it from a slightly different way. Having been involved in actually a fair number of the studies used to underpin some of this, I'm curious as to how much relooking we think we're going to need to do based on the reemergence of Russia as being muscular.

And in some respects especially in terms of the air defense capability that we keep in house, we're just going to -- it's really an unfair question to ask you.

But knowing what a lot of our studies were, that led us to where we're at now, what do we think we're going to be -- do we think we've got a robust enough force to take on that expeditionary piece, out in places like Georgia or Poland if we needed to?

GEN. HALVERSON: Yeah.

Hey, John, that's a good question, because obviously you know that we have all been studying the actions of the Russians in Georgia very carefully to see some of their tactics, techniques, procedures, what they did from -- their operational concepts that they did to just seeing them, that they had no body armor or anything when they went in through the towns, I mean, so all those subtle things. You can see the intent of what Russia does. So we all in the Defense Department are studying and looking at it.

Now, holistically from a capabilities perspective, we have looked clearly, especially on, you know, missile defense, you know, the whole ADA laydowns from THAAD, you know, their mix of the ADA systems in the protect side, especially for missile protect, very carefully and are building capacity to meet those.

So very, very thing is, we look at ourselves and we grow the Army. There are certain decisions that the chief will make on what capability. But clearly, you know, the air defense capability is one that we look at quite rapidly, in capability.

And also from a money perspective, we -- (inaudible). If you go to, you know, page 37 in the document, you'll kind of see, you know, what we're trying to look at from a THAAD perspective -- ADAM, you know, the C-RAM, the SLAMRAAM and the JLENS aspects of this.

So we are pushing this thing pretty hard, especially on to a missile defense perspective, an air defense perspective.

Q Thank you, sir.

MS. KYZER: I believe we had a couple of people join in a little bit later. Is there anyone else on the call with a question who hasn't yet asked one? Did we have anyone join the question?

Q Lindy, hi. This is Bryan Carroll, my apologizes. We had a little bit of a technical difficulty on this end, but if I can jump in, I'd love to.

MS. KYZER: Okay, this is -- oh, this is Bryan. Okay. Great.

Q Yeah, little bit of technical difficulties out here at Leavenworth, but we're on the line now.

MS. KYZER: Okay.

GEN. HALVERSON: All right, Bryan. Go ahead.

Q Sir, thanks for taking time out of your schedule to do this. But I had a couple questions for you. One of them is -- I've worked the FCS program for about a year with Major General Williams, when I came back from my first tour, and huge believer in it, especially with the spin-outs and the spin-out

testing that went on out at White Sands and WSMR and Fort Bliss there with Colonel -- (name inaudible).

How do you see right now -- with a lot of talk that we're seeing in the news of a certain Major Kennedy talking about scaling back FCS, what are your concerns there? Because some of the things I'm hearing right now and being a believer in the system and knowing that we're going in the right direction -- has there been any reverberations within the Army, Department of Defense, starting to sorry about this possibility and possible revampings, or are things trucking on for now as they are on schedule?

GEN. HALVERSON: Hey, Bryan. Great question. One is that the Army's committed to this and I think the chief, even this summer, kind of said that, hey, we got to have FCS because I need to be able to do that. So he's really kind of laid out his program, has really worked very hard to -- with Joint Staff, Office of Secretary of Defense and even Congress and stuff to be able to articulate, you know, what we think, you know, the Future Combat System is and what the program is.

And that's -- with his announcement, he says, hey, with these spin-out capabilities, I want to go to my infantry brigade combat teams first, because when I look at capabilities and what gaps are, these spin-outs will assist closing that gap to my IBCTs much quicker and stuff. And that's really, you know, what we're trying to do.

And the other thing is just like you said, you know, Bryan, is that, you know, we are working it very hard.

Right now, from a capabilities perspective, you know, we have 18 micro air vehicles with EOD in theatre. And we've put 36 MADS in the -- you know, the 2nd to the 25th SBCT -- in theater right now, and also, you know, over 5,000 IBOTS (sp) KBOTS (sp) throughout the theater.

So not only are we learning at Fort Bliss, we're also learning in theater and applying some of these capabilities to the soldiers that are there and so we can leverage it. So we've had good success being able to talk with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and we've been committed to our funding strategy to ensure that we do have a good, stable program with this. And the chief is truly, you know -- and the Army -- is very excited about the capabilities that we'll gain with the Future Combat System and the program itself.

So as a matter of fact, what we have done is accelerate -- said, hey, we're not going to wait for this thing to come at a certain end point. We want to spin this stuff out now and get the RD -- the things perfectly, you know, to our soldiers today.

So the reality is just not future anymore. It's going on now, and we're giving capabilities into the soldier. So, you know, that's what's really kind of different is, not only is this (the name?) of the future, it's happening now. We're testing it now at Fort Bliss. And that's why the chief's excited. As soon as we see things that we like, we can bring it up to the senior leaders and say, yes, this is where our investment needs to be, and then, you know, where are we going to push it into the force and the total force?

So I think those are -- that's really kind of where we are from an Army perspective, and everyone should be pretty excited about that, especially --

(inaudible) -- gains through the whole force and the capabilities that the Army will bring to the Office of the Secretary -- I mean to the secretary of Defense.

Q I couldn't agree more with you, sir, I mean both on getting stuff over in Iraq and then coming back from Iraq and getting to work with IMS (sp) and UGS (sp) and things like that, and then seeing them being pushed back towards theater. I mean, it's -- the rapid fielding and getting stuff to the troops over there has been absolutely (phenomenal ?). I can't say enough about it.

The other question I had for you was --

 ${\tt MS.}$  KYZER: Actually, Bryan, we're limiting everybody to one question. I'm sorry. (Inaudible.)

Q Okay, sure. I'm sorry, Lindy.

 ${\tt MS.}$  KYZER: So I want to make sure I go back through the list. We try to be fair and equitable.

Q I'm sorry about that.

MS. KYZER: No problem.

Was there anyone else who hasn't yet asked a question? If not, I'll toss it back to Scott if you have a follow-up.

Q No, that's okay.

MS. KYZER: Okay. Jason?

Q I'm good. Thanks.

MS. KYZER: Greg?

Q Yeah. You know, originally with the FCS program there was a requirement, or at least an objective, of getting a brigade overseas in a certain amount of time -- I can't remember exactly what it was, I think it was 48 hours -- followed by a division, a number of days. I'm just wondering where that stands. Is that still a requirement, or an objective, at least, as far as the FCS brigade combat teams are concerned?

GEN. HALVERSON: Obviously, you're talking about the expeditionary nature of it. And obviously, yes, it's still a requirement from ability to be expeditionary and to be able to load it on a certain amount of time, especially when you look at the FCS brigade itself and that capability. So that's still a requirement that's out there that we are working with as we bring this in, because, you know, we want to be expeditionary, we want to be, you know, agile, we want to be, you know, flexible, and we want to be able to dominate the enemy in the fight. And so, yes, that's still a big, you know, requirement for us to be able to, you know, meet the transportation capabilities and get it in there very quickly.

Q As far as that's concerned, what's the weight of the vehicle? What are you looking at right now, target weight of the MGV right now?

GEN. HALVERSON: I think right now when you talk the MGV and stuff, it's about 30 tons, what the prototypes are right now from a platform perspective.

- Q Thank you.
- MS. KYZER: John, did you have another question?
- Q No, ma'am, I'm good.
- MS. KYZER: Okay. And we're back to you, Bryan.
- Q Good job, Bryan. We knew we'd get to you.
- Q Right. Thanks, Lindy.

A question for you, sir, regarding the MRAPs. I know a lot of the stuff that we're pushing towards with FCS and both with other programs are kind of in line with it, but with the huge fielding we've had with the MRAP program going over into theater, how do you see that affecting a lot of our long-range goals?

Do you see the MRAP sticking around and being something that we say, yeah, we're going to use this and we're not going to go towards a lot of the lighter vehicles that we were programming, or are we going to continue with the programming of those vehicles and the MRAP has really become kind of an inlieu-of vehicle?

GEN. HALVERSON: That's a good question, because, you know, a lot of us understand, you know, that the MRAP has done a lot of great things, you know, for our soldiers in theater and are saving their lives every day. And it is a great capability that we have.

Now, as you know, it wasn't as integrated as you'd like, because it was -- kind of bought the vehicle and now put, you know, a GFE in there -- we call government-provided equipment -- to get it the crew, the coms, the weapons systems, the -- those types of issues that you need to add on it. But we are studying that, because obviously the Army is committed to -- we've bought some from the joint program office, and so we're looking at where that nests in there.

The other thing, as you know, is we're going to be looking at how to integrate that with the (TL ?) needs, because some of the MRAPs, as you know, are very similar to the route-clearance vehicles and all those types of vehicles. So we're looking at the mix and stuff, how do we grow that capacity a little bit better.

But the other thing is we're still very committed to -- with other programs we're looking -- like the JLTV and all those stuff (sic) are still things that we think are very viable, because what it brings to the next -- future.

So just like the tough thing you asked, Bryan, MRAPs, where does it fit? We've committed it. Where is it going to do (sic)? There's probably some places that we see that in the future it can do, but also, it's not as integrated as we need it to be.

We're going to have to look at that very hard from the program. And we're committed, working with the Marine Corps and stuff, on the things on the JLTV which, we think, fill a requirement out there.

So just to let you know, that work is going on. But it's a great question, because there's been a lot of capital investments in there. And we need to look at that.

Q Awesome, sir, and ask a follow-up if I can. But I don't know if that's in the rules right now.

Lindy, can you correct me?

MS. KYZER: Yeah, that's fine.

Q Okay. Last follow-up for you, and I might have missed this because I was having some problems getting on earlier.

But what right now personally for you, sir, and I know that pushing equipment that's needed for GWOT right now down to the soldier level and getting it to our actual gunslingers that need it is the overall priority.

But what are the programs right now that you see personally as the ones that we really need to concentrate on and really need to focus on and to complete the development and get out there?

GEN. HALVERSON: Yeah.

That's a great question because, I think, we need to continue to look at -- from a strategic sense, continue to look at, how do we protect ourselves at key locations as we build capacity? That's a very big program, like we said, and that's kind of air defense.

I think the chemical and the biological thing is something that we need to know; our ability to be able to see ourselves. I think battle command and unified battle command and how we empower the network is going to be extremely important for us, because that's what we're seeing.

Even on the ground, we're seeing the fusion aspect of ops and intel and getting the capability -- (inaudible) -- along with other joint capabilities of ISR, to facilitate us to be able to defeat the enemy in a very timely manner are very huge. Then along with, you know, our ability to, you know, with the soldier, keep on arming the soldier with the equipment he needs to protect himself. And then finally I think we need to really continue to push the technologies.

I mean, this is the kind of Manhattan Projects like you all -- and get the industrial base to help us, you know, to push these technologies, so we can accelerate our spinouts, get the technology more mature, so we can do those; accelerate the capabilities to our soldiers. Because you know, as you know, getting it to the soldier's level, in that network, to the soldier's level, that's where we're having huge payoffs.

And we've done some small things with some, you know, certain brigades and some battalions. But that's very important that we've tested where we want to go with the FCS and that whole concept with the, you know, the ground soldier and stuff as a system.

Those types of capabilities, where that soldier has that capability, he is now -- (inaubidle). The team leader has, you know, absolute visibility of what he needs to know. He knows who's friend or foe. And he knows the precision fires that he wants to be able to hit a target.

So even precision fires, as you know, are so imperative in today's environment, because you're in an urban environment. You've got to be able to have precision fires and just destroy the enemy and not worry about -- (inaudible) -- aspect.

So those are kind of some programs that we're really pushing, from my foxhole, on a basis up here. But I think you'd be very, you know, proud to know that your Army is in persistent conflict, is just not saying, I'm going to have, you know, not modernize while we're doing it.

You know, our soldiers deserve better. We need to sit there and modernize so the next iteration, because we have a learning enemy in this persistent conflict.

He's trying to pull new things out there. We're seeing new threats. So this day of that, you know, no one's not trying to, you know, everyone's, you know, not, you know, everyone's friendly and not trying to do something is wrong. They are.

So we have to learn with that. And so what we have to do with those soldiers in contact; we have to give them the best and the most, so they can sit there and defeat this enemy and come home with their heads held high of victory.

So that's kind of from my, you know, foxhole, you know. Force Development director and my job when I was the G-33 are very good things, because they're very attuned to what we need to do from an Army's perspective. Q Awesome. Thank you so much, sir. And thank you for taking the time out. I know how busy you guys are up there, but thank you for taking the time to do this. Greatly appreciate it.

GEN. HALVERSON: All right, thanks, man.

MS. KYZER: Now, I'll leave it to General Halverson for just a last comment or two, if he has one.

GEN. HALVERSON: No, I just want to say thank you. We're very proud of our, you know, modernization strategy. We tried to put it in, you know, a pamphlet that people could read and appreciate instead of something -- I think it's also there -- it's very linked to the ends, ways and means of how we want to get there, so it assists you with priorities. It kind of shows you where we're going and it kind of puts, obviously, as I would say, the stability in the program that we need to be able to, you know, fight and win in this persistent conflict.

So restoring balance to our force from an equipping standpoint and modernization and then obviously giving us full-spectrum dominance as a -- (inaudible) -- is important for us as we fight our nation's wars.

So thanks very much. And I've enjoyed this time with y'all.

Q Thank you, sir.

MS. KYZER: Thank you so much, General Halverson. Thanks, everyone, for participating in today's roundtable. Thanks for DOD for hosting us. You can find the transcript and audio file at defenselink.mil/blogger.

This concludes today's roundtable. Have a great day. Thank you, everyone.

END.